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The CHAIRMAN (France) (translation from French): The fifteenth meeting of the Committee is called to order. I call upon the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): After three weeks' work in this Committee we are bound once again to revert to the main tasks ahead of us and to our basic approach to the Committee's work. The statement made at our last meeting on 1 April by the United States representative, Mr. Eaton, in which he gave an answer to our question concerning the attitude of the Western delegations to the drafting of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, and how in general they visualize the course of our future negotiations, obliges us to return to this question. The Soviet delegation has already had the opportunity of making preliminary observations on Mr. Eaton's statement. We indicated that we were disappointed in this statement and that it could not serve as a basis for a constructive solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament in conformity with the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly (A/RUS/1378(XIV)).

We now consider it necessary to deal in greater detail with the United States representative's statement since choice of the direction of further negotiations in our Committee is directly connected with the substance of the problem of general and complete disarmament, which in the United Nations General Assembly resolution was rightly called "the most important one facing the world today".

The position of the United States delegation as outlined in Mr. Eaton's declaration is stated in six points. Let us examine these points.

In the first point Mr. Eaton told us:

"We intend to sit here patiently and work out measures leading toward the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" (TNCD/PV.14, page 9).

A noteworthy feature of this part of Mr. Eaton's reply is an admission that our goal is general and complete disarmament. We would recall that at the beginning of our work the French representative, Mr. Moch, said that he would like to consider as our only task not general and complete disarmament, but some limitation and reduction of armed forces and armaments, and if we recall that Mr. Eaton himself at the meeting of 18 March said that the words "general and complete disarmament" -- I quote him -- "have become... hollow words -- words
shorn of all meaning" (TNCD/PV.4, page 15), the United States delegation's present recognition of general and complete disarmament as our goal can therefore be considered as a certain step forward. Whereas at the beginning it wanted to put aside altogether the very idea of general and complete disarmament, it now proves compelled to recognize such disarmament at least as a goal.

Let us recall that after the statement by Mr. Moch which I have mentioned we asked whether the Western Powers still supported the resolution of the General Assembly on general and complete disarmament; and the Western delegations one by one, though with some vacillation, confirmed their support of this resolution. Thus the United Kingdom delegation at the meeting on 21 March, the Canadian delegation at the meeting on 29 March, and the Italian delegation at the meeting on 28 March directly stated that they supported the General Assembly resolution in all its paragraphs, and consequently not only the third operative paragraph, which refers to general and complete disarmament as a goal, but also the first paragraph in which the United Nations General Assembly calls upon States to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem.

Mr. Eaton's latest statement, however, expresses support virtually for only one part of this resolution: that which refers to general and complete disarmament as a goal. As a result the question arises: does the United States Government -- by whose authority the United States delegation, headed by Mr. Eaton, speaks here -- intend to confine itself to mere verbal recognition of the goal of general and complete disarmament, or does it intend to make efforts to reach agreement on the practical attainment of this goal?

The subsequent points in Mr. Eaton's statement give rise to serious doubts on this score. In the second point of his statement Mr. Eaton asserts that the Soviet plan of general and complete disarmament "will not meet this objective" (TNCD/PV.14, page 3); that is, the objective of general and complete disarmament.

We admit that the Western delegations may have certain objections to the Soviet plan; they may not agree with it; they are entitled to make various comments on it. We have repeatedly stated that we are ready to hear and carefully to consider all such comments and views, additions and amendments. But when the United States delegation, having made no serious comments on the substance of the Soviet plan in all the three weeks of the Committee's work, states that the Soviet plan does not meet the objective of general and complete disarmament, this gives rise not only to astonishment but also to the thought that there is something not so good behind it.
Indeed, the United States delegation must know that the attention of the whole world has already been focussed on the Soviet plan for general and complete disarmament for over six months; that it was precisely the submission of this plan by the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, N.S. Khrushchev, for consideration by the United Nations that in fact led to the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the resolution on general and complete disarmament for which your country, Mr. Eaton, also voted; and that not only the very idea of general and complete disarmament, but also the Soviet programme for such disarmament, has won the direct support of many States.

This, for instance, is what Mr. Jawahararl Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, a great Asian Power, said at a civic reception in Delhi on 24 January 1960:

"The proposal made by Mr. Khrushchev is a courageous and brave proposal, a proposal of foresight and one which demands great attention by other countries also. It is a different matter that you can make some changes in it here and there. But fundamentally that is a sound proposal, which the world today needs, the common people of the world."

The Government of Indonesia, another great Asian Power, in a joint Soviet-Indonesian declaration made on 28 February last, stated that it supported the proposal of the Soviet Union on general and complete disarmament and expressed the hope that it might be implemented. The Prime Minister of Afghanistan, Mohammed Daoud, in his statement made on 2 March 1960, called the Soviet proposal on general and complete disarmament "a firm foundation for a long and lasting peace", and stressed that "the effective implementation of this good measure will surely save mankind from destruction and ensure happiness and tranquillity which is the ultimate goal."

Many other States of Europe, Asia and Africa support the Soviet programme of general and complete disarmament, apart from the wholehearted welcome given to it by the overwhelming majority of the peoples of all the countries of the world.

Since, in spite of all this, the United States delegation declares that the Soviet plan will not meet the objective of general and complete disarmament, we deem it necessary to say this to the United States representative:

First, Mr. Eaton, it should be understood that your statement alone is clearly not sufficient to nullify the Soviet programme of general and complete disarmament, which enjoys such wide support the world over.
Secondly, the attempts of the United States delegation to evade examination of the substance of the Soviet programme can only confirm the general impression that in these negotiations on disarmament the United States pursues aims which have no bearing on general and complete disarmament.

What are those aims?

It seems that a reply to this question may be found in the utterances of certain leading public men in the United States, and particularly in a speech made by Mr. Herter, Secretary of State of the United States, at a luncheon at the National Press Club on 18 February 1960. In that speech the Secretary of State of the United States, after saying that the United States Government was "about to make a new effort in the Ten Nation Disarmament Committee", frankly stated that that effort "complements the national military programmes". This apparently constitutes the true aim of the United States delegation in our Committee: to divert the negotiations on disarmament so that they may complement the military programme of the United States. If, however, the object of our presence here is to prepare measures to complement the military programme of some State or other, we are not likely to succeed in working out any disarmament measures at all, let alone a programme of general and complete disarmament.

It is becoming more and more obvious to us that the Western disarmament plan does indeed fit the aim established by Mr. Herter, even though Mr. Eaton in the third point of his statement says, without adducing any evidence, that the Western plan will meet the objective of general and complete disarmament.

In the discussion of various specific questions at the Committee's meetings the Soviet delegation and the delegations of the other socialist countries have pointed out that the Western plan in no manner constitutes a programme of general and complete disarmament, and therefore does not comply with the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. We shall revert to this question later. I should like at present to say only this: the Western Powers' plan does not propose measures which, taken together, would constitute general and complete disarmament. It does not provide for a complete ban on atomic weapons, including the destruction of existing stocks of these, nor for a complete liquidation of the armed forces and conventional armaments of States, nor for liquidation of military bases on foreign territory, nor yet for the cessation and prohibition of all military activity.
The authors of the Western plan themselves have as much as admitted that it is not a plan for general and complete disarmament. I may remind you that at our meeting on 17 March the representative of France said that the United Kingdom disarmament plan submitted by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd to the United Nations General Assembly in September 1959 "cannot be termed a plan for general and complete disarmament" (TNCD/FV.3, page 20). Those are the very words Mr. Moch used. And yet Mr. Ormsby-Gore, the United Kingdom representative, when on 16 March he submitted the plan of the five Western Powers to the Committee, explained that the plan "embodies all the essential features of the proposal outlined by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd" (TNCD/FV.2, page 13), and then confined himself to developing that proposal in a more detailed form.

I should say that the Western plan, not being a plan for general and complete disarmament, is simply a plan for setting up general and complete control without any real disarmament measures. This is apparently the sense in which it complements the military programmes of the Western Powers, especially that of the United States, of which Mr. Herter, Secretary of State of the United States, spoke in his speech of 18 April, an extract from which I have just quoted. Mr. Herter at that time suggested quite unambiguously that the United States military programme needed complementing by the establishment of universal "arms" control -- not disarmament control, but arms control. That is exactly the object which the Five Western Powers' plan fulfils. Whatever point of the plan we take, it deals mainly and even exclusively with control, control without disarmament, arms control.

The Western disarmament plan is apparently required to complement the Western military programmes in one more respect: it is designed to give the Western Powers, and first and foremost the United States, certain unilateral military advantages. Is that not proved by the constant emphasis in this plan on establishing control first of all over those types of armaments in the development of which the Western Powers, as they themselves admit, are lagging behind the Soviet Union? It cannot very well be regarded as accidental that the Western plan provides for measures to set up control over the possible use of outer space for military purposes and over long-range missiles, but says nothing about the liquidation of military bases on foreign territory.
But, let us turn again to Mr. Eaton's statement. In the fourth point of that statement it is declared that the United States delegation "is not prepared to accept any sweeping, meaningless, age-worn slogans as a guide for our work in Geneva in the days to come". (TNCD/FV.14, page 9)

Mr. Eaton has not told us what he means by meaningless and age-worn slogans. However, this question, too, appears to be answered in Mr. Herter's speech of 13 February last. The Secretary of State spoke on that occasion against "merely ... repeating or endorsing hollow slogans, such as 'ban the bomb', 'give up foreign bases', or 'cut armed forces by one-third'." Is this not what Mr. Eaton means when he speaks of "meaningless and age-worn slogans"?

It is perfectly clear, however, that general and complete disarmament is inconceivable without a complete ban on nuclear weapons -- that is, on atomic bombs -- the liquidation of military bases on foreign territory, and reduction, at first say by one-third and later by more, and finally complete liquidation of the armed forces of States. How can these be called hollow, meaningless or age-worn slogans? These are not hollow slogans, but most essential parts of the programme of general and complete disarmament which the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly asked us to work out. General and complete disarmament itself may also be termed a hollow slogan in order to provide a pretext for evading negotiations on its implementation. Perhaps this is precisely what the Western Powers want. If it is, let them say so openly.

The fifth point of the United States representative's statement of 1 April says that the United States delegation is prepared, "as a start, to discuss and negotiate in detail and in specific terms reasonable, balanced and safeguarded measures of disarmament of the scope contained in parts I and II of the Western plan ..." (ibid.) Can this point of Mr. Eaton's statement be understood otherwise than that the United States means to confine our discussion here, in this Committee, to the narrow limits of the Western plan, and not even of the whole Western plan, but only of its first and second parts?

In our view the demand that only one of the plans submitted to the Committee should be discussed is an irrelevant and hopeless attempt to put pressure upon the delegations of the States represented in the Committee. We deem it necessary in this connexion to state quite definitively and unequivocally that in negotiations with the Soviet Union and with the other socialist States a method of this kind has never produced and can never produce results. It can only testify to unwillingness to conduct serious businesslike negotiations, which can be conducted only on a basis of equality.
Considering what Mr. Herter said about the objects to be pursued by the United States delegation in the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament, it is hardly surprising that that delegation is endeavouring to limit the Committee's work to examination of the measures contained in the first two parts of the Western plan. Both these parts, you see, contain a wide range of measures of arms control, which the United States of America is eager to see established. The first part provides for the establishment of an international disarmament organization; prior notification to that organization of proposed launchings of space vehicles; collection of information on present force levels and armaments of States. The second part deals with the setting up of a system of control over the prohibition against placing into orbit or stationing in outer space vehicles capable of mass destruction; the setting up of control over missile launching sites and over places of manufacture of such missiles; control over the cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes; establishment of a wide control system on the pretext of preventing surprise attacks; verification of budgets, and so forth.

Concerning measures of disarmament, the first two parts of the Western plan, as has already been pointed out by the Soviet delegation, provide actually for one such measure only, and that on a very limited scale: reduction to 2.1 million of the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union only -- but not, for some reason, of the United Kingdom and France -- and that not at once but at some future date after the completion of numerous studies and investigations of various control systems. Can an insignificant reduction of the armed forces of only two great Powers, with complete retention by both, of their war machines and all their means of waging war, including missiles and nuclear weapons, be deemed a real step towards general and complete disarmament? Of course not. Mr. Ormsby-Gore, the United Kingdom representative, admitted this at our meeting on 29 March when he said that "... the measures set out in the first stage of the Western plan, although they might look rather formidable on paper, consisted of a number of comparatively minor measures ..." (TNCD/FV.11, page 29). This seems clear enough.
Mr. Moch, the representative of France, in a speech at our Committee's meeting on 1 April, confirmed that by the end of the implementation of the measures provided in the first two parts of the Western plan, States will retain both their armed forces and their stocks of armaments -- conventional and nuclear. In this connexion Mr. Moch spoke of a state of equilibrium towards which the world would thus be moving. Has not the French representative in view that "balance of terror" which some Western politicians have of late been attempting to advance as a means of ensuring peace under the conditions of a continuing arms race?

N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, speaking a few days ago, on 24 March, at a lunch given by the Prime Minister of the French Republic, Mr. Debré, showed how completely futile such attempts are. He said:

"Some politicians maintain that peace can be ensured by a 'balance of terror'. In reality this means not stopping but continuing the arms race. It is well known that heaping up weapons has never strengthened peace. On the contrary it has made peace unstable, and has tempted certain circles in certain States to resort to a 'trial of strength' and to 'try their luck' on the battlefield. What guarantee is there at present that the policy of a 'balance of terror' will not lead to war? There is no such guarantee. Oral declarations by various advocates of this dangerous policy cannot be regarded as a guarantee."

We should like to make one more comment on the United States delegation's request that the Committee should consider only the Western plan, or rather only its first two stages. Mr. Eaton said that the Western delegations were "prepared to be flexible" in discussing the measures in the first and second stages of the Western plan. As we understand him so far, by being flexible he apparently means discussing here in the Committee one or another of the isolated control measures provided for during these two stages. The head of the United States delegation proposed indeed at an earlier meeting that we should proceed to work out in detail the problems of controlling the reduction of armed force, mentioning by way of example or illustration the settling of force level ceilings for the
United States and the Soviet Union at 2.5 million, with a subsequent reduction to 2.1 million men. At the meeting of April Mr. Eaton proposed that we should proceed to work out in detail the problems of control over the military use of outer space. The Italian representative, Mr. Cavalletti, advocated that we first of all prepare in full detail an agreement on the international disarmament organization, without discussing the measures the organization would have to control. Similar proposals have been made by other Western delegations.

Is it not obvious that to adopt such proposals would foredoom the Committee's work to utter failure as far as real measures of disarmament are concerned?

A few words now about the last of the six points in Mr. Eaton's statement of 1 April:

"When those first measures have been agreed we are prepared to negotiate those further measures necessary to achieve the goal which has been set for us by the resolution of the United Nations and the agreement of the four Foreign Ministers which gave birth to this conference" (TNCD/PV.14, page 9).

What does that mean? Clearly it can only mean that we should engage in interminable negotiations on individual isolated measures, chiefly control measures, instead of proceeding at once to work out a concrete programme of general and complete disarmament.

The Italian representative, Mr. Martino, said something like that at our meeting of 21 March. Speaking about the desirability of reaching agreement on the initial measures, he observed on that occasion that this agreement "could be followed by other discussions and other agreements aimed at the ultimate goal". (TNCD/PV.5, page 13).

As may be seen from Mr. Eaton's speech and the remark by Mr. Martino I have just quoted, the Western Powers are evidently not ready to and do not want to set about preparing a treaty on general and complete disarmament, because that does not suit their purpose, and all they want is to have interminable talks here on control measures.
No, Sirs; the United Nations General Assembly resolution on general and complete disarmament, which we all voted for, sets us an entirely different task. We should like to point out to all the participants in our Committee that this resolution is not just one of many resolutions on various matters adopted by United Nations bodies. It is a resolution of particular importance, since it embodies a completely new approach to the great problem of our times, that of disarmament: an approach envisaging the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

This new approach did not come about by chance; it was dictated by life itself; for mankind is now confronted with the frightful threat of a war of missiles and nuclear weapons, a threat of dimensions unparalleled by anything in the past; and it has become clear that this threat can only be removed if the actual physical instruments and means of war are destroyed. Now that nuclear weapons have struck deep roots into the entire armament system of States, the only thing that can really remove the threat of missile nuclear war and lay a stable foundation for lasting peace is, not partial measures of disarmament, and still less measures of control in isolation from measures of disarmament, but a radical solution to the problem of the complete destruction of all weapons, nuclear and missile weapons included, the elimination of all armed forces, and the cessation of all military activities, including military training of all kinds.

Of course we realize that it is no simple matter to reach agreement on carrying out general and complete disarmament. But we believe that the marked relaxation of international tension achieved in the past year is creating favourable conditions for doing so by helping to strengthen mutual trust between States with different social systems. The Soviet Union by taking a unilateral decision to make a major reduction -- of 1,200,000 men -- in its armed forces, has shown its goodwill and facilitated solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament. It is now for the Western Powers to show by deeds their own goodwill and their resolve honestly to implement the resolution on general and complete disarmament which they voted for.
In conclusion, I should just like to say that the course proposed by Mr. Eaton in his statement of 1 April is not appropriate if we are to comply with the requirements of the United Nations General Assembly resolution on general and complete disarmament. As we have shown, it can only put us on a sidetrack that does not lead to disarmament, and the Soviet delegation will not follow that course.

We have nevertheless not lost hope that the Western delegations will abandon the approach to disarmament negotiations outlined by the United States representative, and will show themselves willing to set about tackling the task of general and complete disarmament.

To accomplish this task we consider necessary, and we are prepared --

To start at once to draft a treaty on general and complete disarmament or, to begin with, its main provisions, its basic principles;

As a first step, to reach agreement on the general scope of the measures of general and complete disarmament;

To lay down stages and time-limits for carrying out general and complete disarmament, so as to make the disarmament programme concrete and logical;

To provide that, at all the stages of general and complete disarmament, effective international control should be established over specific measures of disarmament, so that no State can avoid fulfilling the obligations it has assumed under the treaty on general and complete disarmament.

This is the direction which we propose that our negotiations in this Committee should take. It is precisely the approach adapted to the United Nations General Assembly resolution on general and complete disarmament.

During our further negotiations the Soviet delegation is prepared to consider carefully all proposals, submitted by any delegation, aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Government has submitted for consideration by all the countries in the world a proposal on general and complete disarmament perfectly adapted to this task. Eighty-two States have by unanimous decision referred this Soviet Government proposal to our Committee for thorough consideration, and no delegation is entitled to set aside this decision or to refuse to discuss the concrete problem of general and complete disarmament that is now before us and has already won general recognition as a great programme of peace. This Committee's
main task is to work out, in the words of the communique issued by N. S. Khrushchev and General de Gaulle,

"... certain agreed points of view on general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

The Soviet delegation is ready to make every effort to ensure that an agreement on general and complete disarmament is reached in the shortest possible time, and expects that the other delegations will make a constructive contribution towards the accomplishment of this historic mission.

The CHAIRMAN (France) (translation from French): The statement which Mr. Zorin has just made is sufficiently serious -- I would even say sufficiently grave -- for me, as representative of France, to reserve my right to reply when I have carefully read the text as distributed to us. But without waiting for the verbatim record I should like, once again, to point out to Mr. Zorin the danger of truncated quotations. It is not for me to deal with those taken from a speech by the United States Secretary of State, even though, like some of my colleagues, I was present when it was made. On the other hand, where my own words are quoted, I am entitled immediately to point out the impropriety of omitting half the sentence.

Mr. Zorin spoke of levels which I had mentioned, and wondered whether they were levels in the balance of terror.

Here is the correct version of the sentence to which he alluded, quoting it in an incomplete form. Speaking of conventional disarmament, I said, on 1 April:

"The world will thus be moving towards a state of equilibrium ..."

-- that was what Mr. Zorin read out, but the sentence goes on, and the rest was not read out --

"... at a very much lower level than at present; 'and that is the necessary condition for future advances towards a state of complete disarmament"

(TNCD/FV.14, page 14).

The sentence, when complete, takes on an entirely different meaning from that of the first few words taken separately.
Mr. Eaton (United States of America): In common with the representative of France, I should like to study very carefully the remarks of Mr. Zorin, which call for extensive scrutiny, and careful answer. As he said in his concluding words — and as we said of ourselves last Friday — he is here to find some way of attaining the goal that has been set us. However, I should just like to read into the record portions of the statement made by Secretary Herter, some of which were omitted by Mr. Zorin. At the beginning of his talk on 18 February, Secretary Herter said:

"I would like to talk today about a very important element of American foreign policy — our search for safeguarded arms limitation and progress toward general disarmament.

As you know, we are about to make a new effort in the Ten Nation Disarmament Commission that will meet in Geneva about the middle of March. This effort is designed, not only to strengthen international peace and avoid wasteful use of the world's resources, but also to promote our national security, in the real sense of that term. It complements the national military programs and collective security arrangements that we carry out to this same end.

America's deep commitment to a policy of arms limitation and disarmament is of long standing."

The CHAIRMAN (France) (translation from French): If there are no other speakers, I shall read out the communiqué:

"The fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament was held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 4 April under the chairmanship of the representative of France.

"The next meeting of the Conference will take place on Tuesday, 5 April, at 10.30 a.m."

Are there any objections? ...

The draft communiqué is approved.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.